



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM.

XXXV, 3.

1. pp. 321-335. J. Steup. Herodotus IX 106, and Thucydides. A slight inversion of the argument will make it seem clearer in an abridged statement. From Hdt. IX 106 it appears that the Asiatic cities of the mainland were excluded from the Greek confederacy formed immediately after the battle of Mykale. This is clearly contradicted by Diod. Sic. XI 37. Accordingly Kirchhoff and others have argued that the statement of Diodorus must be rejected. But the statement in Herodotus, as it stands, is inconsistent with itself. We read there, *προθύμως εἶξαν οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι*. But if it be true that the cities of the mainland were excluded, it was the *Athenians* who really gave up their point. Before calling attention to this inconsistency, however, Steup examines the indirect testimony of Thucydides. He finds in Thuc. I 89 (*Λεωτυχίδης μὲν ὁ βασιλεὺς κτλ*), I 95 (*ἡδὴ δὲ βαιῖον—ἡλευθέρωντο*), VI 76 (*ἡγεμόνες γὰρ γενόμενοι κτλ*), a distinct implication in support of the version of the story given by Diodorus. But it is exceedingly improbable that Herodotus and Thucydides can have made contradictory statements about a matter of such notoriety and such cardinal importance. Everything leads us, then, to suspect that the passage in Herodotus has suffered some injury or loss in the course of the centuries since it was penned. Steup proposes to insert *καὶ τοὺς ἡπειρώτας* after *τοὺς ἄλλους νησιώτας*. With this reading all goes smoothly. Herodotus no longer contradicts himself, nor is he contradicted by Thucydides and Diodorus. Most readers will probably be convinced by the argument as a whole, though some points do not seem entirely conclusive. Minute discussion is out of place here; but Thuc. I 89 is surely capable of an interpretation consistent with Kirchhoff's assumption. In this passage Steup conjectures that *ἡδὴ ἀφ᾽εστηκότες ἀπὸ βασιλείας* is agloss, and seeks to defend the *ξύμμαχοι*, bracketed by Wilamowitz. I cannot agree with him on either point. The argument from the speech of Hermokrates (VI 76) seems over-acute. But on the other hand it must be admitted that the passage in Thuc. I 95 is incapable of any other natural interpretation than the one given by Steup. In the words *καὶ ὅσοι νεωστὶ ἡλευθέρωντο* we must find an allusion to the events of the year 479. In this passage Steup argues strongly that *κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές* must be an interpolation. He does not convince me. The greater portion of the allies who addressed their prayer to the Athenians at this time were Ionians, who could perfectly well put forward their kinship in support of their petition, in spite of the fact that a rather important portion of their associates were of another stock. For it is sufficiently proved that the Lesbians, at least, joined the Ionians in this prayer.

2. pp. 336-349. P. Schroeder. Bentley's copy of Ammianus Marcellinus. In R. M. XXXIII, pp. 468 sqq., appeared a communication from Zangemeister, giving a part of the emendations contained in Bentley's copy of Ammianus Marcellinus, now in the British Museum. Schroeder completes the task which Zangemeister had begun.

3. pp. 350-363. P. Weizsäcker. Investigations in regard to the Vase of Klitias and Ergotimus. The writer began his discussion of the François Vase in vol. XXXIII, and gives now his general conclusions. He discards all attempts to name the specific poem in which the artists found their inspiration as fruitless: "Der in den Epen verarbeitete Stoff allein ist es, welchen die Künstler zu verarbeiten pflegten. Die Art der Zusammenstellung und der das Ganze beherrschende Grundgedanke gehört also dem Künstler und nicht dem Dichter, oder der Dichter ist der Künstler selbst." Weizsäcker is sure the vase was a *κρατήρ*, and explains the purpose of the artists on this theory. He believes it was made at Athens during the period 520-500 B. C. The style of the discussion is exceedingly agreeable.

4. pp. 364-372. A. Weidemann. The Greek Inscription of Ipsambul, an attempt to fix the date of this famous inscription. The question to be settled is, which one of the four Egyptian kings of the name was the Psammetichus whom the Greek mercenaries of the inscription served. Most scholars who have discussed the question, and especially Kirchhoff, have settled upon Psammetichus I. W. argues that the story of Herod. II 28 is incredible; that Herod. II 30 by no means proves that Psammetichus I. was ever at Elephantine; and that the whole story of which the latter passage forms a part is without historical value. Furthermore, the entire absence of inscriptions with the name of Psammetichus I. at Elephantine affords very strong evidence that he never was there. Letronne and others thought of Psammetichus IV; but it is wholly improbable that he ever ruled Nubia, and the inscription itself is plainly older than his time. Psammetichus III. is entirely out of the question. Psammetichus II. remains. Gutschmid and Bergk (Lit. Gesch. I, p. 105) have assigned the inscription to his reign. W. now supports this view by fuller proof. Herod. II 161 informs us that this king made an expedition to Ethiopia; the fact that Herodotus knew of the expedition at all makes it probable that Greek mercenaries were employed. Further, Aristaeas (a trustworthy writer so far as matters of this sort are concerned) tells of Semitic allies of Psammetichus. But beside our inscription are found Phoenician inscriptions of similar import; and the Greek inscription contains the name of a Phoenician, Πασιδών, which is merely a compound of Egyptian formation, meaning "the Sidonian." Here arises a difficulty. One of the Phoenician inscriptions gives the name of the commanding general as Hor: the Greek inscription speaks of those *τοὶ σὺν Ψαμματίχῳ τῷ Θεοκλοῦς ἐπλεον*. But we learn from an inscription now in the Louvre that a certain Hor was a general and administrator holding the highest position in the beginning of the reign of the next later king: we also learn that he had the further name Psemtekmench. The syllable *mench* is an ending of the sort which the Greeks almost regularly rejected in making over Egyptian names. To be sure, the name of the father of Hor was Aufer and not Theokles, but this fact is of little importance. The Greeks often replaced Egyptian names which they could not or would not pronounce by Greek names of simple formation. The inscription belongs, then, to the period B. C. 594-589. Two or three special remarks follow. W. citing Herod. II 154 finds in the *ἀλ[λ.]όγλωσσ[ος]* a Carian; *Κέρκιος*, he thinks, is probably a mistaken reading for *Κέρτιος*. In Egyptian *Kerti* means the level water of the river above the first cataract.

5. pp. 373-389. W. Hoerschelmann. Critical remarks on Apollonius Dyscolus de pronomine. These remarks are based on the recent edition of Schneider. Many of H.'s observations will be found of interest by scholars who care for Greek grammar.

6. pp. 390-407. F. Buecheler: Coniectanea de Silio Juvenale Plauto aliis poetis Latinis—a series of concise and pregnant discussions. Attention is called to the stoic zeal of Silius Italicus. Pliny's description of the poet's occupations (Ep. III 7) is illustrated by a reference to Epictetus III 8, fin. A number of notes on Juvenal follow:

I 79. *Facit indignatio versum*: an intentionally faulty line.—IV 33. *Fracta de merce siluros*: salted fish, spoiled on account of accidental cracks in the jars. —IV 34-36. *Incipe Calliope, licet et considerare*. B. cites Ov. Met. V 338, Prop. II 10, 11. Then for *prosit mihi vos dixisse puellas* he cites Verg. Aen. IX 91, and remarks: immane quantum falluntur qui Musas intellegunt virgines pudicas.—V 104. B. refers to Galen III cap. 30, calling attention to the fact that Tiberinus served as the ordinary name of a sort of fish caught in the river near the city in water polluted by sewers. Perhaps a reference to Hor. Sat. II 2, 31 (where see Orelli's note) might lead to a slight modification of B.'s view. Compare also Mayor's note on the present passage.—V 135: *frater ab ipsis ilibus*. "Aliud ab valet, aliud de." Trebius is addressed as a frater ὁμόσπλαγχνος.—VI 82: "recte codex *ludum*, comitata est gladiatorum catervam." B. compares VII 185, where "optime codex *condit*." "Magis cavebat Juvenalis versum quam sermonem ne corrumpere."—VI 107. B. conjectures *deformia*, *ficus*.—VI 326. Why *Nestoris hirnea*? "Nescio an traxerit ex Atellanis."—VIII 194. A genuine verse: the point lies in the word *celsi*,—the proper epithet of a knight, i. e. of a man born of lower rank than the prostitute senators.—VIII 247: *frangebat vertice vitem*. "Frangit fustem qui percutit et pulsat, non qui patitur verbera." "*Verticis* igitur nova quaerenda est interpretatio." "Fortasse . . . iam pridem castrensi sermone primos quosque in centuriis milites coeperant appellare vertices."—IX 129. Borrowed by Auson. Epigr. XIII.—IX 133, 134. B. writes: *alter amator gratus erit, tu tantum*.—X 359. The passage gives a summary of the doctrine of the Tusculan Disputations. The last word of 359 must be written *dolores*.—XI 106. "Juvenalis nudam clipeo et hasta effigiem Martis, sine armis suis advolantem deum in amplexus declaravit." It seems incredible that any tolerable scholar should ever have dreamed of taking the words in any other sense, but the feat has been accomplished by more than one, and B. does well to cite Ov. Fast. III 1, 9, 10.

Next comes a learned note on Plaut. Aul. 627 (IV 4, 10, Gruter). The slave's misunderstanding of Euclio's word *pone* is explained by supposing this adverb to have been regularly used by the vulgar as an indeclinable noun. Among other illustrations a gloss is cited from Hesychius: πωννός ὁ προκτός. In the same connection comes a fragmentary epigram against Pompey out of Plotius. "Verba ista contendo in disticho fuisse conlocata ad hunc modum—

quem  
non pudet et rubet, est non homo sed ropio."

B. connects *ropio* with *robustus*, *ruber*, and explains by quoting *Priapi rubrum porrectum ab inguine palum*. Perhaps Calvus was the author of the epigram.

Very interesting is the note on a gloss of Placidus: *Fabricora proverbium in eos qui domesticis alimentis usi aliis laborarent. Dictum ab eo quod Capitolium aedificant Tarquinio fabros et structores corvi cum suo victu miserunt.* B. writes *fabri Cora* and in the last line *Corani*. To me it seems the proverb itself must have been *Fabri Corani*. There are several more notes on Placidus, one on a curious contamination of Claudian with Luxorius, and finally the genuine name *Grattius* is restored to the poet, hitherto known as Gratius.

7. pp. 408-430. J. Freudenthal. On Phavorinus and the Florilegia of the Middle Ages. F. has found that a Paris manuscript contains several genuine fragments of the *γνωμολογικά* of Phavorinus together with others falsely ascribed to him, but really borrowed from the borrower Diogenes Laertius. The discussion of the relations of Diogenes, Stobaeus and later collectors of similar character to Phavorinus and to each other is both learned and acute.

8. pp. 431-447. F. Leo: *Vindiciae Propertianae*. This article will be read with delight by those who have had occasion seriously to consider what manner of task it is to convert an ancient manuscript into a book. Careful students of Propertius will wish to read Leo's discussions for themselves: only a list of the passages treated, with the proposed corrections, can be given here. It will be seen that a good part of Leo's care has been given to punctuation. The importance of this matter—that is, of considering with what inflections a poet would have wished his lines to be read—is not often so thoroughly considered as Dionysius Thrax would have it.—I 1, 24: "nec graecum nec latinum est *Cytaines* vel *Cytainis* . . . verum mihi videtur *Cytheidis* vel potius *Cytheidis*."—I 19, 16 sq. Grator et (Tellus hoc ita iusta sinat!) quamvis te longae remorentur fata senectae.—II 1, 5: sive illam *video* fulgentem incedere *Cois*. Doubtful, perhaps; but Leo's argument, on the whole, against Lachmann's transpositions in this passage is very strong.—v. 11, he writes: *Seu compescentes* somnum declinat ocellos.—II 5, 18: parce *iniusta nimis*, vita, nocere tibi.—II 5, 27: scribam igitur, quod non umquam *tibi* dealeat aetas.—III 13, 48: *Delius* Iliacis miles in aggeribus.—III 28, 53: et quot Troia tulit vetus et quot Achaia formas | *Atridae* et Priami diruta regna senis.—III 29, 5: atque alii faculas, alii *intendere* sagittas.—III 29, 21: atque ita me iniecto *laxarunt* rursus amictu.—III 29, 41: sic ego tam sancti *discedo elusor* amoris.—III 32, 23: nuper enim de te nostras *malus* *ivit* ad aures.—III 33, 39: non *Oropeae* prosint tibi fata quadrigae aut Capanei magno grata ruina Iovi.—IV 19, 25: at (vos, innuptae, felicius urite taedas!) pendet Cretaea tracta puella rate.—V 2, 12: Vertumni *Tusculus* credidit esse sacrum. Leo had made the correction *Tusculus* (for *rursus*) before learning that it belonged to N. Heinsius.—V 2, 41: nam quid ego adiciam de quo mihi maxima famast? | hortorum in manibus dona probate meis.—V 4, 55: si comes *accipiarve* tua regina sub aula.—V 8, 6: qua penetrat virgo (tale iter omne cave) | ieiuni serpentis honos cum pabula poscit. This is the punctuation of some of the older editors. For serpentis honos (*σέβας δράκοντος*) Leo refers to Hes. Sc. Herc. 144, *δράκοντος φόβος*. For further illustration of the passage, Ach. Tat. VIII 6, 12, and Aelian. de Nat. An. XI 16, are cited.

In a footnote Leo gives the passages in Seneca's Tragedies about which his judgment has changed since the publication of his edition. He now reads H. F. 20, *nuribus sparsa tellus*. H. O. 684: *tenuit placidas Daedalus*

oras.—H. O. 1381: redeuntes minax ferrem ruinas. In another note a capital letter is suggested for *Μεγάλη* (earth), Callim. Hym. in Del. 266, and many illustrations given. In this connection Strabo X, p. 469, is corrected by the insertion of *καὶ* after *θεδν*, (*καὶ Φρυγίαν θεδν Μεγάλην*). Still another note corrects the pseudo-Ovid, Nux v. 110: coniugis Aonidum misit in arma virum.—V. 176: sed non [aura], metus causa tremoris erat: “*aura* omittit codex Marianus: reliquorum οὐδεις λόγος.”

The concluding part of the essay consists of a concise but masterly and exhaustive examination of the authority of the manuscripts of Propertius. The conclusion, which the judicious will accept, may best be given in Leo's words: “Demonstravimus quod demonstrandum erat, codicem Neapolitanum et unum non interpolatum et librum esse multo reliquis lectionis integritate superiorem. Illo igitur in posterum quoque, et unico quidem illo donec similis inventus sit, Properti carminum recensio nitetur. Librarii errores arguere valebit e melioribus vulgaris notae libris quicunque eligetur. Verum ADFV omnino nihil valent.” The reviewer may perhaps be pardoned for calling attention to a particle of evidence on which Leo has not touched. A quotation will introduce the matter: “Sed Baehrensianus in Neapolitanum ex V<sup>2</sup> scripturas istas fluxisse contendit. Hoc si verum esset, N non tantum Vaticano, sed codice recentior esset descripto ex Vaticano iam correcto.” Elsewhere Leo collects the following false readings of the Neapolitanus: I 13, 16, *inlectis* for *iniectis*; I 18, 16, *delectis* for *deiectis*; II 9, 2, *electro* for *eiecto*; III, 29 5, *inlecto* for *iniecto*. This blunder occurring once would not prove much, perhaps; occurring four times, it proves a good deal. The scribe who made the blunder had before him a manuscript in capital letters. Therefore, if the Vaticanus were an ancestor of the Neapolitanus, it would also have these same corrupt readings. This is not the case.

9. pp. 448–455. C. Wachsmuth. Notes on the History of Alexandria. A discussion and refutation of Lumbroso's theories about the topography of the city.

10. pp. 456–468. H. van Herwerden: Ad Plutarchi Vitas. Emendations proposed for 88 passages.

11. pp. 469–496. Miscellanies. W. Ribbeck explains and corrects a number of Homeric scholia.

R. Förster defends his view (R. M. XXX 316) that Plato alludes to Sophron in Rep. V 451, B (*λέγειν δὲ, ἔφην ἐγώ,—προκαλεῖ*). In *τὰνδρείων* and *τὸ γυναικεῖον δράμα* he can find no other sense than that of character pictures. Such pictures are not to be found in the drama, but surely in the Sicilian mimes. Förster cites the recently edited works of Choricus (Apol. Mim. III 10, p. 215 ed. Graux): *οὗτος* (sc. *Σώφρων δλαχὼν Πλάτωνα ἐραστήν*) *μιμεῖται μὲν ἄνδρας, μιμεῖται δὲ γυναῖκας*. Admitting that the arrangement of the mimes in the order known to later readers is probably due to some Alexandrian, Förster thinks the division into *ἀνδρεῖοι* and *γυναικεῖοι*, especially in the light of the known titles, is so natural that it cannot have escaped the eyes of Plato's contemporaries.

A. Ludwich proposes to read Nonnus Dion. XXVIII 287: *ἀνθερίκων πάτον ἄκρον κτλ.*

H. Tiedke gives also notes on Nonnus. Dion. XXXIII 56, he defends ῥίψε against Ludwich, explaining: "pallore infecta Venus ridere desiit.—XLVII 649–50, T. proposes ἐνὶ λάρνακι μείζονι δεσμῷ | πλωτὸν ἀκοντίζω.—XV 411, sq.: εἰς τίνα λόχμην | ἵχθους ἄγω.

F. Susemihl gives notes and conjectures on the Magna Moralia of Aristotle.

E. Rohde discusses Suidas's treatment of the Tyrannios, and corrects the form of a statement attributed to the younger. "Und so wird *der Sinn* . . . durch folgende Schreibung hergestellt: ἄτομα μὲν εἶναι τὰ κύρια ὀνόματα, τμητέα δὲ τὰ προσηγορικά, ἀθέματα δὲ τὰ μετοχικά, θεματικά δὲ τὰ πρωτότυπα ἀντώνυμα."

G. Goetz gives up the view he formerly expressed, that no traces of double recension were to be found in the Menaechmi of Plautus.

E. Schulze proposes to read Cic. de Fin. I 23, id est *iudicet* voluptatem.

F. Gloeckner offers notes on Seneca.

K. J. Neumann shows that Eutropius (VIII 19) follows Herodian (IV 2, 1) in his account of the apotheosis of Severus.

F. Susemihl discusses Aristot. Poet. 2, and proposes to read "natürlich nur si licet hariolari": ὥσπερ Πέρσας Τιμόθεος καὶ Ἀργᾶς, Κίκλωπας Τιμόθεος καὶ Φιλόξενος.

T. Koch explains a fragment from the Στρατιώτιδες of Theopompus (Meineke 2, 812). The οἶκος τετρωβολίζων is a family from which both man and wife go to the wars, thus earning two obols each as daily wages.

C. Wachsmuth calls attention to a second statue of Masinissa found in Delos. The inscription is: Βασιλέα Μασαννάσαν Βασιλέως Ταία Ἐρμων Σόλωνος τὸν αὐτοῦ φίλον. Πολιάνθης ἐποίηει.

J. Klein conjectures that Odaenathus received the title of Augustus in the year 264, *consulatu* Valeriani fratris (Trebellius Pollio, Gallieni, cap. 12), and proves from fragmentary inscriptions that the full name of the Torquatus who held the consulship A. D. 124 was C. Bellicius Torquatus Tebanianus.

F. Buecheler explains the Paelignian inscription recently found at Corfinium. The explanation may be summed up in the following translation: Pedes paucos hos (these few feet of ground) incubat senex usa aetate Kaeso (or Gaius) Annaeus omnibus *rebus* dives fortunae *suae* faber.

The reports of the Rheinisches Museum have been unavoidably delayed, but they will now speedily be brought up to date.

J. H. WHEELER.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE U. PAEDAGOGIK. FLECKEISEN U. MASIVS. 1880.<sup>1</sup>

## IX.

79. K. Zacher discusses Vergil's *pictura*, Aen. I 466 ff., and after showing the impossibility of representing these scenes by groups of statuary in a pediment (as Weidner, Ladewig, and Kvičala take them), and the probability that Vergil had a Roman rather than a Greek temple in mind, he concludes that the description is of a mural painting, and not of a group of statuary, no matter how disposed (pp. 577–601).

<sup>1</sup> See American Journal of Philology, Vol. II p. 265 foll.

80. Aratus, at the head of a band of conspirators, set out from Argos to overthrow Nicocles, tyrant of Sicyon, and chose for his watchword 'Απόλλων Ὑπερδέξιος. W. H. Roscher draws an ingenious parallel between the relations of Aratus to Nicocles and of Apollo to the Python in the cultus of Sicyon, so as to show the *raison d'être* of this watchword. Plutarch states that Brutus chose for his watchword in the battle of Philippi "Apollo," but Valerius Max. I 5, 7, says *qui deus* (Apollo) *Philippensi acie a Caesare et Antonio signo datus in eum telum convertit*. From a story told by Suetonius (de Aug. 94), according to which Augustus was flattered by being called the son of Apollo, R. believes that the statement of Valerius is the true one.

81. The editor, Prof. Fleckeisen, proposes to write in Plaut. Amphitryo 98 ff., *quocum Alcumenast nupta, Electri filia*, and takes Electri, nom. Electrus, from an original Electron, Gr. Ἠλεκτρον, comparing ἀρχιτέκτων = architectus, Εὐθήμων = Euthemus. If the Amphitryo has for its original some play of the new Attic comedy, we have here a proof of the existence of the form Ἠλέκτρον (instead of Ἠλεκτρόων)—a form recently found in a Rhodian inscription discussed by Möllendorf, Hermes XIV, p. 457. The question is whether the traditional Ἠλεκτρόωνος and Ἠλεκτρούωνη in pseudo-Hesiod's Scutum ought not to be written without the *v*? (pp. 605-608).

82. R. Arnoldt proposes ὅς πολλῶ βρύσας ποτ' ἐπαίνῳ for ὅς πολλῶ ρέυσας κ. τ. εἰ. Aristoph. Knights 526.

83. L. Gurlitt gives, as an appendix to his dissertation "de M. Tulli Cic. epistulis earumque pristina collectione," a careful discussion of the order and connection of the correspondence between Cicero and Decimus Brutus; and concludes that this collection of letters exists substantially in the same completeness and order as it was edited by Tiro and known to antiquity. (pp. 609-623.)

84. C. Wagener discusses Caesar's Bellum Gallicum V 43, 1, particularly the expression *fusili ex argilla*, and proposes to change this to *fusilis ex argilla*, connecting *fusilis* as acc. plur. with *glandes*.

85. W. H. Kolster treats of the composition and spirit of the tenth Eclogue of Vergil in an article of twenty-five pages, five of which are taken up with a profitless discussion of the relation of Lycoris to Gallus and Antonius, and of Lycoris to Cytheris. The parallelism between Theocritus Idyll I 64-83 and this ode is pointed out in detail. K. accepts in general Ribbeck's analysis of the ode, believes with him that after v. 41 there is a lacuna, and rejects *tantum* from v. 46.

86. F. M. M. Schröter reviews Heydenreich's "libellus incerti auctoris de Constantino Magno ejusque Matre Helena, e codicibus primus edidit." According to this brief romance, now first published, Constantine was the natural son of Helena, was stolen by tradesmen, gained the hand of the daughter of the Greek emperor, was banished with his bride to a desolate island, rescued by seamen and brought back to Rome. There he opened an inn, was at last recognized through his valor, and became the heir of the Roman and Greek Empire. Schröter thinks that H. assigns too high an antiquity to this composition, the language indicating a mediaeval origin only. This romance throws light on the gloss of Suidas on Constantine. (pp. 649-653.)



87. E. Ludwig and E. Rohde contribute textual emendations of Heydenreich's editio princeps just noticed. R. thinks the composition cannot date earlier than the twelfth century, and may have been written in France, at any rate not in Rome.

88. A mural inscription, found in Pompeii, discussed by E. Rohde.

89. M. Petschenig defends the reading *sic* (changed by critics to *secundo* or *secus*) in V. Gallicanus's life of Avidius Cassius 10, 1: from a number of other instances he infers that *sic* after *primum* or *prius* may have in later Latin the sense of *deinde*.

#### X, XI.

90. Karl Brugman reviews Delbrück's *Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, which forms Part IV of his *Syntaktische Forschungen*. In nearly all points B. accepts Delbrück's results. The two chief points in which he dissents are as follows: D. maintains the old view that the middle voice inflection in its reflexive force may represent the subject as interested indirectly, *i. e.* in a dative relation, as in περιβάλλομαι χλανίδα, or as interested directly, *i. e.* in an accusative relation, as in χρίεται. B. denies that any case relation can be shown originally to inhere in the middle formation; there is just as good reason, he thinks, for accepting a possessive relation in ἐγκαλύπτομαι τὴν κεφαλὴν or a locative relation in χαίρομαι.<sup>1</sup> B. dissents further, as might be expected of the author of 'Morphologische Untersuchungen,' from Delbrück's treatment of the future δώσω, πράξω, as identical with the Sanskrit and Lithuanian future with *sio*, *sie* (Sansk. dâsjâmi, Lith. sûksiu). (pp. 657-671.)

91. G. Krüger proposes to change in Soph. Elect. 528 ἡ γὰρ Δίκη νῦν εἶλεν τοῖς γὰρ Δίκη ξυνείλεν—one of those changes that are possible, just as any number of alterations in the text of Shakespeare are possible for a critic that thinks he could do better than the poet has done. There is some reason in Krüger's emendation of ὁ δ' ἄμδς for ὁ δ' ἄλλος in v. 601 of the same play. (It appears from a statement in No. XII of the Jahrb. that Wex and Meineke had already proposed the same change of reading.)

92. O. Amdohr contributes a careful though incomplete study of the use of the comparative in Homer. Starting with the distinction between the proper *comparative* idea as expressed by μᾶλλον = magis, and the *adversative* or *contrasting* idea as expressed by μάλλον = potius, the writer discusses all the instances he has found of the use of the comparative in the latter sense. (This use of the comparative might have been traced in post-Homeric Greek with profit to the discussion; light upon this subject might also be expected from the use of μᾶλλον with the comparative, as in II Ω 283.) (pp. 673-681.)

93. G. Benseler argues from II. N 669, Ω 400, Ψ 296, that in the Heroic age military service was due from chieftains to their suzerain, and that ἀστρατεία was punishable for nobles as well as for common people.

94. Th. Schreiber discusses the form of the Delian myth of Apollo Pythoktonos, particularly as represented in a vase painting formerly interpreted by him and by a medal belonging to the Charvet collection. In the painting

<sup>1</sup> Brugman seems to have forgotten that χαίρομαι is a barbarism (Schol. on Ar. Pax 291). —B. L. G.

Apollo is a child in the arms of Leto, and is aiming an arrow at the serpent; the medal represents him as a young man full of vigor, ready to meet the onset of the monster, while Leto and Artemis are absent. Schreiber believes that from a comparison with the local myth of Delphi it is evident that the medal representation is the original, and in keeping with the Apollo cultus. (pp. 685-688.)

95. J. Golisch proposes *μαστήρ* for *μάτηρ* in Soph. Trach. 526, and R. Löbach *ὁ στερκτός γόνος* for *ὅσπερ ἦν γόνος*, Philoct. 425.

96. H. Guhrauer replies to K. von Jan's review of his dissertation on the history of flute-music, *αὐλωδία*. (The review is noticed in vol. I, p. 373, Amer. Journ. Philol.) G. argues against Jan's theory that the *αὐλωδός* was identical with the *αὐλητής*, (1) from the inherent physical difficulty that one and the same person should perform a prelude on an *αὐλός* (which, acc. to von Jan, was most like to a modern double oboe), and then at once sing a solo; and (2) from the difficulty of interpreting on this theory the statements of the ancient writers. Guhrauer's reply is convincing. He accepts the conclusions in reference to the nature of the Pythian *nomos* to which Jan has come in Philologus XXXVIII, p. 378 ff. (pp. 689-705.)

97. A. Lowinski conjectures that a line has fallen out after v. 26 of Aesch. Sept., and proposes to insert *ἄγων ἑκατὶ Δοξίων κρυθήσεται*. By the restoration of this line the *στιχομυθία* of the prologue is made exact; but the reading is purely *aus der luft gegriffen*.

98. In Susenhihl's discussion of the date of Plato's Phaedrus we have a good example of what such a discussion should be; courteous towards dissenting views, yet sharp in criticism, full of learning, yet free from pedantry. S. dissents from Usener's conclusion (see Rhein. Museum XXXV; see Am. Jour. of Phil., vol. I, p. 237) that the time of the publication of this dialogue falls, at the latest, in the first half of 402 B. C., maintaining, on the contrary, that the Phaedrus could not have been written before the death of Socrates, and that, as Zeller argues, it was the first composed after the eight special Socratic dialogues, not more than three years after the death of Socrates. How far differences of style may form a criterion for determining the relative order of the dialogues, and what relation different dialogues bear to the travels of Plato, are questions incidentally discussed. (pp. 707-724.)

99. A. Funck has made a painstaking collection of examples of the omission of the pronoun as subj. accus. of the infinitive in the Latin comic poets. His object is to disprove Dräger's statement in his Hist. Syntax II, § 454, that the omission of the subj. accus. in the earlier Latin is very rare, and begins to be common first after Livy. He seems to have made out a clear case. (pp. 725-734.)

100. Four of G. Kaibel's Epigrammata Graeca are emended by R. Arnoldt.

101. F. Hankel contributes a very satisfactory paper on the Roman camp as described by Polybius VI 27-32. While agreeing in many points with Nissen, H. follows Marquardt in the matter of dimensions. The latter part of the paper is devoted to the vexed question of the designation of the gates. (pp. 737-763.)

102. C. Schrader dissents from H. Peter's opinion in the second edition of his *Fasti*, in regard to the date of the dedication of the newly restored temple of Concordia, referred to by Ovid I 637-650.

103. Textual criticism of passages in Lucretius, by C. M. Franken and S. Brandt.

104. A favorable review of G. Landgraf's "de Figuris Etymologicis," by P. Thielmann. The author extends the term etymological figure to all combinations of noun and verb, of two nouns, two verbs, two adjectives, of kindred origin and sense and bearing some grammatical relation to each other. Many interesting questions are raised.

105. Moriz Schmidt proposes in Catullus, Carm. 65, 9: *ergo auscultabo nunquam te suave loquentem*. He argues for the separateness of the first forty lines of the Carm. 68, chiefly against the opinion of Kiessling, and interprets *utriusque*, v. 39, as referring not to *munera Musarum et Veneris*, but to the loan of two *scripta*. Schmidt argues for the change of *ultra* for *ultro* in v. 40. W. H. Roscher follows with a confirmation of Haupt's emendation of *Naiasin* for *Minosim*, 64, 287, drawn from two passages in Theocritus and Callimachus, in which nymphs are represented as the inhabitants of the vale of Tempe. The word *Doris* he takes as an adjective for *Doriis*, an allusion, he thinks, to the fact that Dorians once lived in the valley of the Peneus. Cf. Herod. I 56; Strabo IX 437. (pp. 777-787.)

106. A. Dederich defends *oppida Batavorum* in Tac. Hist. V 19 as against *oppidum B.*, and charges Heräus with confounding the meaning of *moles* and *agger* in his comment on *diruit (Civilis) molem*.

107. G. Uhlig discusses the origin and form of the interjection *εἰέν*, and argues in favor of writing it *εἰέν* and of disconnecting it from *εἶα*. The spiritus asper in the middle is based upon a passage in Theodoretus' treatise *περὶ πνευμάτων*, a treatise found in Codex Havniensis No. 1965, and in Baroccianus No. 68 (new Bodleian Catalogue, p. 102), but now first carefully examined and made serviceable by Uhlig for a correction of Herodian's *Pneumatology*. Prof. W. Studemund, of the University of Strassburg, has been engaged on the same studies, and is preparing an edition of the treatise of Theodoretus, the appearance of which is expected with interest.

## XII.

108. A. Höck takes up the discussion begun by Gilbert in his review of Hartel's *Demosthenische Studien* (see Amer. Journ. Philol., vol. II 269), of the *προχειροτονία*, especially in its relation to the introduction of envoys into the ecclesia. Höck agrees in the main with Gilbert, as against Hartel, adding but little, however, to the solution of the question. The chief point of interest in his article is the inference, drawn chiefly from the law quoted by Aeschin c. Timarch. 23, to the effect that so far as the introduction of envoys into the assembly was concerned, the *προχειροτονία* was required only in case the regular session for hearing *κίρρυκες* and *πρεσβεῖαι* was so far off as to make it necessary, in the opinion of the *βουλή*, that an embassy be introduced at once or at the first subsequent meeting of the assembly. The evidence for this is hardly sufficient. (pp. 801-811.)

109. K. Dziatzko calculates that the *Θησαυρός* of Menander must have been composed between 310 and 308 B. C.

110. A. Vogel adds to the fragments of Nearchus of Crete a number of passages taken chiefly from Arrian, Strabo, and Philostratus. (pp. 813-820.)

111. E. Hiller defends the traditional reading of Theocritus V 38, and corroborates the interpretation of the scholiast by Stobaeus Flor. XIV 12.

112. A valuable article on the present status of the question concerning the sources of the Lexicon of Hesychius, by H. Flach. Starting with the work of Otto Schneider, who was the first to state sharply the relation of Suidas to Hesychius, Flach gives a rapid sketch of the contributions to this subject by C. Wachsmuth, Volkmann, and Rohde, and then discusses more at length the dissertation of Daub "de Suidae Biographicorum Origine et Fide," and censures his inclination "to lead the question from the domain of final probability to that of endless possibility." He dissents particularly from Daub's view that one of the chief sources of Hesychius must have been Philon's 12 books *περὶ κτήσεως καὶ ἐκλογῆς βιβλίων*. (pp. 821-833.)

113. Review by H. Zurborg of M. Büdinger's treatise on the position of Cleon in Athens as represented by Thucydides. Zurborg commends especially the author's view, in opposition to Grote's partisan treatment of the character and conduct of the Athenian demos at this period. He does not agree with B. that the tenor of the speech of Diodotus (Bk. III, 42 ff.) is not in harmony with the preference of Thucydides.

114. S. Brandt comments on a passage of Lucilius (Müller's edition) XXVIII 1.

115. From a comparison of the passages in which Lucretius uses *omne*, C. Gneisse concludes that the common interpretation of this word as meaning the universe, *i. e.* the sum of all existence and of all space, is incorrect; that Lucretius does not include in that term *omne quod est spatium*, but that when he intends to include space in his conception of the universe he uses *summa summarum* or *summa tota*.

116. W. H. Roscher modifies his rule for the position of *uterque* and *ubique*, given in a previous article (see Amer. Journ. Philol. II 268), and anticipates a point made by E. Meyer on the position of *uterque* in Cicero. Meyer also shows that *uterque* and *ubique* cannot be brought under the same rule anyway, and so in the end there is but little left of Roscher's original statement.

117. Discussion of three glosses of Placidus, by A. Deuerling.

118. W. H. Kolster contributes another study on Vergil's Eclogues, this time on the fourth. With all the appreciative and incisive criticism of the writer, who can accept his allegorical interpretation and take the *puer nascens* of the poem as the *ordo* of v. 5 personified—the hoped-for fruit of the treaty of Brundisium? His view of *tuus jam regnat Apollo*, v. 10, as being an allusion to Augustus (see No. 80 above), is doubtless correct and makes against his own theory. No wonder that Kolster finds it difficult to interpret the last four lines, and thinks Vergil ought to have stopped with v. 59. (pp. 849-863.)

119. L. Mendelssohn discusses briefly the age and authority of Codex Mediceus 49, 7, 49, 18, Dresdensis 111, which contain some of Cicero's letters. (pp. 863-864).

M. L. D'OOGHE.

PHILOLOGUS. Göttingen. Vol. XL, Parts I and II.

*Latin Language and Literature.*

In Cato de Mor. II 17-18, C. Hartung proposes, by change of punctuation, to get a better sense: he puts the colon after *abundet*, so as to make the clause *cum sumptus abundet* concessive to *utere*: this change, as his own translation shows, misses the meaning of *sumptus*. His second suggestion, at 11, 14, to change *vincit* into *vicit*, though not necessary, is pleasing.

In Coelius Antipater, Unger, at pp. 183-186, attacks the theories of Gilbert and of Sieglin, and makes an independent effort to distribute the events of the second Punic war, as far as they are given in the fragments, among the seven books of which the *Historiae* consisted. According to Unger's scheme, the eighteen years of that war, from 218 to 201 B. C., were so arranged that the first three books treated of two years each, and the last four books of three years each. To reach this pretty symmetry of construction, a passage in Priscian III, p. 98, has to be changed from *Caelius in primo historiaram* into *C. in II historiaram*.

In Caesar Bell. Gall. IV 29, Hammer, at p. 186, makes an ingenious attempt to get a correct sense from the badly tangled sentence *ita uno tempore*, etc. He proposes to transpose the relative clauses, so as to refer the words *quae ad ancoras erant deligatae* to the antecedent *longas naves*, and the words *quibus—curaverat quasque-subduxerat* to the antecedent *onerarias*. The passage, as it stands, is unquestionably corrupt: the sense brought out by H's emendation is sound. But the origin of so strange an error is hard to imagine.

In Vergil, Aen. III 682-688, Köstlin, at pp. 179-180, tries with some ingenuity, but in vain, to amend the desperate passage into sense. In v. 684 he inserts *ac* after *contra*, and in v. 686 he changes *certum est* into *certent*. There is a sense in this, but not the sense that Vergil meant. We are tempted, in dealing with this passage, to follow the heroic remedy prescribed by Bährens in Bursian's Jahresbericht, 1877, II, 50, to leave out the words from *Scyllam* down to *certum est*, as a foolish interpolation, and to accept as v. 684,

*Contra jussa monent Heleni dare lintea retro.*

Thus to cut off the offending lines altogether would only be a fair vengeance upon a passage which more perhaps than any even in Vergil has defied scholars' ingenuity.

At p. 180 Köstlin tries, without changing the text, to explain the difficulties in Verg. Aen. XII 513-520. The *fratres Lycia missos* were Clarus and Themon, brothers of Sarpedon, not named here because already named in X 125. The *moestum Onitem* is the doomed son of Hercules and Deianira, born under the curse. The name *Menoeten*, derived from *οἶτος*, denotes the son of that Molorchus who regaled Hercules with wine after his battle with the Hydra. Much here is fanciful and far-fetched: but Köstlin's treatment of the obscure passage is learned and suggestive.

In Livy XXVII 15, 5, Unger, at p. 186, proves by reference to c. 22, 9, of the same book, that *naves quas Livius—habuerat* ought to be *quas Laevinus-habuerat*.

In Vergil, again, von Leutsch, at p. 121, discusses Aen. VI 42-44. He shows that the *aditus* of v. 43 were intended only for sound to pass, and were distinct from the *limen* of v. 45 and the *fores* of v. 47. At p. 138 the same scholar returns to the same passage, and shows that in vv. 40-41, *talibus ad fata*, etc., we have not the beginning of the new passage, but the end of the preceding one. This is seen, and done, both by Ladewig and by Nisard, in their respective texts. At p. 166, in discussing Aen. VI 20 seqq., he shows how the Icarus myth came to be here brought in by Vergil. From the manners of the Sibyl, the German professor, with his mind full of Bismarck and the German *Culturkampf*, goes on gravely to infer "that even in these old times, the spiritual power tried, at every good opportunity, to make its assumed superiority felt by the temporal power."

In Manilius, Astron. II 5, Köstlin, at p. 182, proposes to change *gemmata per aequora Ponto* into *geminataque tempora Ponto*: the ten years of war at Troy are doubled by ten on the sea. At v. 7 he applauds the brilliant conjecture of Bentley, who changed *patria quae jura petentem* into *patria cui Gracia septem*: but he amends the emendation by suggesting *patria cui injuria septem*, as cleaving closer to MS. tradition. This is very clever criticism. In Astron. IV 189 seqq., Köstlin, again stepping in Bentley's steps, changes *ora magisterio nudosque coercita virgo* into

*ora magisterio RUGISQUE coercita virgo,*

where, as he explains, he takes *rugis* as sign, not of old age, but of serious contemplation. The wrath of Erigone upon this audacious and monstrous piece of criticism! Only the spectacles are needed to make this caricature of the heavenly schoolma'am complete.

In Valerius Flaccus, Köstlin, at p. 387, examines and approves some conjectures of R. Ellis, published in Journal of Philology IX, pp. 52-61. But in IV 130 he disapproves his change of *preme* into *treme*, and by comparison with Verg. Aen. X 501 seq., he proposes to change the obscure hemistich *regis preme dare secundos* into

*rebus periture secundis.*

The thought is ingenious, but the conjecture too wild for serious discussion. In I 420 seqq. he shares with Ellis his objection to *coelataque plumbo*, Carrion's reading for the obviously incorrect *celera plumbo*. He differs, however, from Ellis (*fert alternantia plumbo*) as to the cure of the line, and proposes *portat crepitantia plumbo*. The epithet *crepitantia* is surely improper and impossible in connection with *plumbo*. In I 528 seqq. he examines and rejects Bährens' conjecture, and arrives at a perfectly good reading by simply pointing after *temptataque*. It ought to be observed, however, that this punctuation and the resulting sense have been already given by Nisard in his edition of 1875. In III 143 (not II 143, as printed) he confirms, by reference to Hom. II. VI 67, the clever emendation by which Bährens changes *opima cadavera nostro* into *opima cadavere Nestor*. Again, in IV 308, by reference to Verg. Aen. VI 33, he gives brilliant confirmation to Bährens' conjectural change of *cadit malis* into *ceciditque manus*. This method of looking back to Valerius's models to divine his thoughts and phraseology is very wise and fruitful. Finally, in dealing

with the obscure and corrupt passage I 489-97, Köstlin succeeds by a bold and beautiful conjecture in constructing a correct and poetic reading. He changes

*dominoque timentem  
urget equum teneras compressus pectore tigres*

into *dominique timentem . . . compressas pectore tigres*. Nothing could be better than this. In I 494 K. adopts the admirable conjecture of Eyssenhardt, who changes *ut pariter* into *it pariter*.

In Sextus Aurelius Victor, *de viris illustribus*, Helmreich, at pp. 167-169, gives to cc. 47-77 a long list of variant readings taken from the MS. described in Philologus vol. XXXIX.

In Festus, Unger, at pp. 187-189, shows s. v. Februarius that, by a blunder of Paulus, three distinct passages on the origin of the month-name have been violently compressed into two; and that, by this confusion, there is ascribed to Juno in the Roman ritual a part that really belongs to the god Inuus, cf. Livy II 5, 2.

#### *Roman History and Antiquities.*

A. Müller discusses in two long essays, pp. 122-138, and 221-276, many curious points connected with the dress and armature of the Roman legionaries under the Empire. His researches go into the minutest points of military tailoring; but his method, although tedious, is sound, and his results will serve to fill up many gaps in our Lexicon and classical dictionaries. His first essay is called "Studies on the Armature of the Roman Legionaries." He proves, against Genthe's authority, that the cuirass worn by the legionary soldiers, at least during the first four centuries of the empire, was not of leather, but of metal. This metal cuirass he then proves to be, in material and construction, the real *lorica segmentata*, which, according to the old opinion, was a piece of fancy costume never really used by soldiers, but only carved upon their monuments, etc., as an artistic decoration. After proving the actual use of the *l. segmentata* by soldiers in the field, he shows, against Marquardt's authority, that the *l. segmentata* was a form of cuirass taken by the Romans from the Etrurians, but adopted by the Etrurians with some practical modifications from the *στάδιος θώραξ* of the Greek infantry. The second essay is on "The Sepulchral Monuments of Roman Warriors." In it he tries, from personal inspection of twenty monuments of *caligati* which he found in Italy, and of a much larger number of monuments to *equites*, to fix the name and the construction of the chief articles of the soldiers' equipment. With the facts thus gathered from the monuments he collates all the scattered notices that occur in the literature. From all he shows that the dead soldiers are portrayed on their monuments, not in any parade costume, not even in battle array, but in their working-dress of daily life. The *sagum* and the *paenula*, the latter with its invariable *cucullus*, lasted on from republican times into the late empire; and they each existed in four distinct styles. The accurate description of these garments is the newest and most valuable part of the essay. The *toga*, if worn at all by soldiers, was worn only by officers. The monuments to *equites* are much more highly ornamented than those of *caligati*. The one horse on the monument is the symbol of the private soldier, two of the *sesquiplicarius*, and three, as Müller shows against

Herzen's authority, of the *decurio*. The *cista*, so often found on such monuments, was not intended as symbol of Bellona-worship, as has been supposed, but to hold the food for the dead man's use. The feast-scene, so often carved on such monuments, is not a representation of the funeral-feast, but a picture of the man himself in the daily scenes of his home-life. In this last point Müller's result is independently confirmed by an eloquent study of Athenian sepulchral monuments published last year in the *Revue des deux Mondes*.

Illhardt, in a short essay on "Titus and the Jewish Temple," pp. 189-196, shows that Titus neither wished, as Josephus thought, to preserve the temple permanently, nor desired to have it sacked and destroyed by his soldiers. He knew that, in order to break the resistance of the Jewish nation, the temple must be destroyed; but he wished to secure the treasures contained in it for the imperial government, and especially to satisfy his own curiosity as to the sanctuary and its contents. Illhardt argues against the authority of Bernays, that the passage on this subject in the chronicle of Sulpicius Severus (II 30, 6) is not derived from Tacitus.

*Greek Language and Literature.*

In Aeschylus, L. Schmidt proposes, at p. 172, to change the unmeaning line, Septem adv. Thebas 793 (ed. Ahrens=773 ed. Hermann)

θαρσεῖτε, παῖδες μητέρων τεθραμμένοι,  
into                    θαρσεῖτε παῖδες· μὴ τρέσῃς τεθραγμένην.

In spite of what is said to defend it, this sudden change from the plural to the singular is intolerably harsh. Hermann's old conjecture, *τεθρυνμένοι* for *τεθραμμένοι*, still seems to be the best.

In Sophocles, L. Schmidt, at pp. 169-171, brings forward a series of conjectures to the text of Oedipus Coloneus. In v. 402, instead of *ὁ τύμβος δυστυχῶν*, he conjectures *ὁ τύμβος δίχα τυχῶν*. The local meaning here given to *τυχῶν* does not belong to the language of tragedy; and, even if that meaning be admitted, the tense of the *τυχῶν* is impossible. The text, though not very well expressed, is not without fit meaning; but, if it is to be changed, the old conjecture of Schenkl *δυστυχοῦσι* gives a clear sense with the least possible change.

In v. 589 he proposes to cure the violent displacement of the *με* by changing *ἀναγκάζουσι* to *ἀναρπάσσουσι*. If that will not do, as it certainly will not, then he proposes to change *κομίζειν* into *ποθ' ἕλειν*! Metre forces poets to displace words even worse than this poor *με* is displaced; but, if there must be change, then Hartung's change of *με* into *σε* is the easiest and best.

In vv. 703-4 he changes *γῆρα σημαίων* into *γῆρα συνναίων*. This is possible; but the old reading, though less commonplace in grammar, is of higher poetical power.

In v. 1534 he changes *αἱ δὲ μυρία πόλεις* into *σφῆ δὲ μορία πόλεις*. This is mere wantonness of change. Apart from the poetic vigor of the passage thus mutilated, this intrusion of the possessive *σφῆ* into the language of tragic dialogue is incorrect.

In v. 1584 he tries to get sense into the corrupt passage by changing

ὧς λελοιπότα κείνον τὸν ἀεὶ βίον,  
into                    ὧς λελοιπότες κείνον ἀνατεῖ βίον.



Even if we concede the unproved meaning given to *ἀνατεῖ* (without sickness, painlessly), the hiatus after *κείνον* is bad.

In 1632 he changes the poetical, but altogether intelligible, *πίστω ἀρχαίαν* into the flat *πίστω ἀρκίαν*. Is *ἀρκίος*, in fact, ever used by the tragedians?

In the Ajax of Sophocles, Müller, at pp. 371-372, brings forward, from an unexpected source, a pleasing and plausible emendation of the doubtful line, v. 923, *οἷος ὦν οἴως ἔχεις*. The verses of Ignatius, called *Στίχοι εἰς τὸν Ἀδάμ*, are, as he observed, made up largely of reminiscences of tragic phraseology. He says, at v. 126, *ποῖος ἀνθ' οἶον πέλεις*. Assuming this to be borrowed from Sophocles, Müller conjectures that the true reading was *οἷος ἀνθ' οἶον πέλεις*, or, with less violence of change,

*οἷος ὦν οἴων κυρεῖς*. Cf. Electra 849.

It is not unlikely that the stolen phrases of Ignatius may thus serve, by an odd turn of fate, to restore to the tragic poets some of their own lost or corrupted treasures.

In the Electra of Sophocles, von Leutsch proposes, at pp. 220 and 270, a series of changes in the anapaestic system vv. 101-114, and in the chorus 137-139. On metrical grounds, in vv. 100 and 101, he rejects *τούτων* and *οὕτως* respectively. On exegetical grounds he rejects *τόδ' ἡμᾶρ* in 106 and *τοὺς εὐνὰς ὑποκλεπτομένους* in 113. He reads v. 105 seq.

*ἔστ' ἂν λείσσω παμφεγγεῖς ἄστρον ῥιπὰς . . .*

In vv. 137-139 he rejects *λιταῖσιν* (*ἀνταις*, Dindorf) on metrical grounds; he changes *λίμνας*, misprinted *λιμνᾶς*, into *κοίτας*; and he changes *οὔτε—οὔτε* into *οὔτε—οὐ*. Thus he reads, in one long line,

*παγκοῖνον κοίτας πατέρ' ἀνστάσεις οὔτε γόοισιν, οὐ θρήνοις.*

In Euripides, L. Schmidt proposes, at p. 172, to change the suspected line, Electra 977,

*ἐγὼ δὲ μητρὸς (μητρὶ, ed. Fix) τοῦ φόνου δώσω δίκας,*  
into *μητρὸς φόνου δὲ μὴ τρέσας δώσω δίκας.*

By this change the antithesis to v. 976 is made clear and strong; but the departure from the text is too great, and the displacement of the *δέ*, although not unprecedented, is harsh.

In Plato, Siebeck discusses, at pp. 175-179, the vexed question of priority in time between the Phaedros and the Gorgias. Zeller, as is known, decides that the Phaedros preceded the Gorgias. Against his authority, and in support of Ueberweg, Siebeck shows that the peculiar theory of the art of rhetoric, broached in the Gorgias, is continued and developed in the Phaedros. He shows farther that the Phaedros, being written later than the Gorgias, contains two almost direct citations from it, 260c from 460b, and 261a from 453a. Incidentally he tries to show the priority in time of Hippias Maior over Phaedros by a citation in Phaedros 261b from Hipp. Mai. 281d and 282b.

L. Schmidt, at p. 383, brings forward an admirable emendation to the Symposium, 220c. 7 (misprinted 22c. 7). For the inexplicable *τῶν Ἰώνων* he conjectures *τῶν ἰδόντων*. This fills the sense and restores the meaning and the text.

In Aristotle, L. Schmidt, at p. 384, suggests an emendation in the suspected essay *περὶ Ζήνωνος κτλ* 978, 2, 23–27 (misprinted 6, 23). He accepts Kern's correction of ταῦτόν, 25, into τὸ ὄν; and he confirms the sense thus gained by changing ἐπὶ τῷ ἡρεμεῖν αὐτῷ χρήται into τῷ ἡρεμεῖν ἐπ' αὐτῷ χρήται. This is acute and convincing.

In Demosthenes, L. Schmidt, at p. 384, makes a futile attempt to change the text of Dem. Mid. § 55 (not 54 as printed). For ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν he proposes to read ὑπὲρ ἀστών. The sense would require ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀστών. There is no absolute need of rejecting αὐτῶν; but, if there must be change, Weil's ἀπάντων is so far the best.

In Theocritus, L. Schmidt, at p. 384, suggests a pretty and plausible correction of the difficult line IV 39. The text,

ὄσον αἶγες ἐμὴν φίλαι, ὅσσον ἀπέσβας,

is undoubtedly corrupt; but the αἶγες is so certainly right that no conjecture which leaves it out can be accepted. Schmidt proposes

ὄσον αἶγες ἐμὴν φίλα ὅσσε τ' ἀπέσβας.

In Menandros, the Rhetorician, Hammer gives, at p. 383, from personal inspection of the Paris MS. the succession of chapters in his *περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, and shows, against Spengel's statement, that the succession differs from that in the Medicean MS.

In Moschus, C. Hartung, at p. 47, discusses several disputed passages. In IV 46 he defends the text *Θήβην κουροτρόφον* against the conjecture *Ιπποτρόφον* by referring to Hom. II. II 510. Here, as elsewhere, Moschus imitates Homer. Chiefly on exegetical grounds, he rejects altogether the clumsy verse IV 37. In IV 88 he shows, from the context, that οἶος, the accepted conjecture for οἶος, cannot be right; and he changes οἶος ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίης into αἶαν ἐπ' ἄλλοτρίην. The sense thus gained is clear and good; and the form αἶα is used once by Theocritus XVII 91.

In Diodorus Siculus, Unger, at p. 175, gives a series of thoughtful and almost certain changes in the text of the 15th book. In c. 19, for τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα συνακινασάμενοι he reads *συνσκευαζόμενοι*, that the participle may correspond, as the sense requires, with *προσαγόμενοι* and *χειρούμενοι*. In the same chapter, *ad fin.*, he adopts Wesseling's suggestion to leave out *μὴ καταδουλοῦσθαι* after τὰς καινὰς συνθήκας; but he rejects the *ἀς* inserted by Wesseling after πόλεις, and changes ὥμοσαν into ὁμόσσαν. By this, the expression becomes more correct, and the thought sharper and clearer. In c. 33, in the speech of Agesilaos, in dealing with the words *νευικηναὶ ἂν πορθουμένη*, he adopts Bekker's suggestion to leave out the *ἂν* as contrary to the sense; but he changes the simple *πορθουμένη* into the compound *διαπορθουμένη*, and thus accounts for the presence of the *ἂν* by the natural confusion between AN and ΔΙΑ. In c. 22 he changes *ἐψηφίσαντο πρὸς Ὀλυμπίους πόλεμον*, as giving a false sense, into *ἐψηφίσαντο π. Ὁ. πόλεμειν*. Finally, starting from the fact that the standing army of the Arcadians was called by the special name of *ἐπάριτοι*, cf. Xen. Hell. 4, 33, he shows that in two passages, cc. 62 and 67, this correct *ἐπάριτοι* has been changed into the unmeaning *ἐπίλεκτοι*.

In Plutarch, Unger, at pp. 384-385, brings new light upon the difficult passage in his life of Solon, c. xxv 19 (ed. Sintenis). He shows on astronomical grounds that the text *τὸ πρὸ συνόδου μόριον* is absurd in sense, and that the change into *τὸ περὶ σύνοδον μόριον* would yield a sense scientifically correct.

In Diogenes Laertius, L. Schmidt suggests, at p. 384, that in the list of Antisthenes' writings given at VI 16, the unmeaning *ἱσογραφή* ought to be changed into *μισθογράφοι*. The context is too scant to give any certainty to such a conjecture.

In Plotinus, H. F. Müller, at p. 179, raises reasonable objection to the words *οὐδὲ δυνατὸν εἶναι ἵνα τις καὶ θαυμάσαι*, and suggests that this monstrous Greek, Ennead. V 8, is the barbarous gloss of some Roman reader, trying to translate literally *ne fieri quidem potest ut quis miretur*. Is this *ἵνα*-construction ever found elsewhere in later Greek after *δυνατὸν*?

In Julian, Schiller discusses, at pp. 385-6, the title of his book against the Christians. He rejects the title constructed by Neumann, *κατὰ Χριστιανῶν λόγοι*, on account of the known fact that Julian never used this word himself and forbade the use of it by others. He thinks it probable that the title was *κατὰ Γαλιλαίων*, on account of the scorn expressed by that word.

In Stephen of Byzantium and in Hesychius, s. vv. *Ἐπαρίται* and *Ἐπαρόητοι* respectively. Unger, at p. 175, shows that these two words are blunders of the copyists for *Ἐπάριτοι*, the special name of the Arcadian soldiery. In the scantiness of our knowledge of Arcadian antiquities and dialect, this changing of the text is dangerous work.

Proksch, in a long essay, pp. 1-47, "On the use of the article, especially with the predicate," starts his discussion from the good definition of Dornseiffen, that "the article serves to define that which is known, or assumed to be known, either by its properties or relations." After clearly presenting the logical law by which the article is excluded from the predicate, he goes on to give many facts and rules that are sufficiently recognized even in our elementary grammars. The clumsiness of the modern languages, and especially of the German, in the use of the article is perhaps his reason for once more calling attention to the cases where the moderns are apt to take the predicate for the subject of the sentence and thus to puzzle themselves about the article. His collection of examples is everywhere full and valuable. His explanation of some difficult passages is acute, and his argument against false views of Madvig and of Kühner is clear and convincing. He enumerates with care the cases where the article, as in *ὁ αὐτός, θάτερον, τοῦναντίον, τὸ λοιπὸν τὰ ἄλλα*, is used in the predicate because it is essential to the meaning of the word. *Αὐτός*, for example, needs the *ὁ* to give it the meaning of 'the same.' The best and most novel part of his essay is where, pp. 35-46, he collects and explains the few sentences in Greek where the article is used with the predicate; and he fully establishes the law that all propositions in which the predicate takes the article are identical propositions, *i. e.* propositions in which the predicate is either logically or really identical in contents with the subject. The careful collection and sorting of examples in this paper make it well worthy of attention by grammarians and writers of grammars.

Herbst contributes to this volume another essay of great length, pp. 271-382, and of splendid merit, on the origin and manner of composition of Thucydides' history. By a detailed criticism of the leading works that have appeared on this subject between 1862 and 1878, he comes back in various ways and under various forms to the restatement of his own conclusion as stated in his first essay, that Thucydides composed his history, from the beginning to the end, as a single work, and continuously, after the end of the whole war, about the year 400 B. C. In admirable temper, but with keen wit and overwhelming logic, this great scholar crushes, one after another, the various champions of Ullrich's theory, and comes back by a new line of demonstration to his own conclusion. The argument of Herbst was so fully stated in the abstract of his former essay<sup>1</sup> that it is not necessary here to repeat it. Apart from that main argument, however, the shrewdness and the marvellous knowledge of the man are exhibited in dealing with many subordinate questions of grammar, style and interpretation. In his knowledge of Thucydides' diction and in his understanding and absolute possession of the text, Herbst has never perhaps been equalled. Even in points of grammatical detail his observations have always a precision of statement and often a brilliant novelty of discovery that make them worthy of being treasured up by grammarians. As a few of many important points, may be cited his discovery of the conditions under which Thucydides uses *Πελοποννήσιοι* as identical with *Λακεδαιμόνιοι*, p. 282 seq.; his explanation of *καθ' ἐκάστους* in II 39, 29, against Poppo, Krüger and Classen; his defence of the text *ἀνθρώ τε* against conjecture in II 39, 14; his defence of the text *παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων* in I 10; his discussion of Thucydides' hyperbola in respect of *ἐπὶ πλέον*, VI 2; his explanation of the double use of *εὐθίς* at p. 339, and of the use of *ὥσπερ* at p. 365. Of the highest interest, however, as a contribution to our knowledge of Greek grammar, is his discovery, by an elaborate induction from the entire text of Thucydides, of the laws according to which he uses the article with proper names (including *nomina Gentilia*)—cf. pp. 372-382 (of which pp. 373-4 are left out by miscount). According to this induction, there are six (6) cases in which Thucydides puts the article to the proper noun:

1. The article stands always with a certain class of proper nouns; *e.g.* ἡ *Ἀσία*, ἡ *Χερσόνησος* (if he means the Thracian Chersonese), etc.
2. The article stands wherever, within the framework of one detached narrative, back reference is made to a name already given; cf. story of Plataea, II 2-6, *e.g.* *Πλάταιαν* II 2, 10 (ed. Böhme), and *τὴν Πλάταιαν* II 2, 10.
3. The article stands wherever the name is used in antithesis with another name; *e.g.* οἱ *Κορίνθιοι*—τῶν *Ἀθηναίων*, I 72, 1.
4. The article stands wherever the name is defined by an attribute or subordinate clause; *e.g.* τῶν *Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ὡς ἐπολέμησαν*, I 1.
5. The article stands wherever a proper name is used to define another noun; *e.g.* *μῖσει τῶν Κερκυραίων*, I 25.
6. The article stands with proper names referred to as known and notorious; *e.g.* τὸν *Μῆδον*, I 69.

On the other hand, Herbst shows that the article is regularly omitted with proper names in (3) three cases:

- a. When a second or third proper name is joined by a connecting particle to a proper name that has the article: *τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ Σικελίας*, I 36, 11.

b. When a new narrative is beginning; e. g. Ἀθηναίους κτλ. I 105.

c. In all general remarks, thrown in by the historian and breaking the chain of narrative; e. g. Κορίνθιοι, I 25, 11.

It is to be hoped that this careful work of the great scholar will be carried on by others, and the habits of other prose-writers observed and mended, so that our grammars may be freed at last from their vague and absurd and false statements in respect of the article with proper names. In testing the MSS. of Thucydides as to their accuracy in this point, Herbst avows that his confidence in the overrated Laurentianus C. has been more and more shaken. He urges upon scholars the acceptance of his own conjecture, the change of τὰ γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν into τὰ γὰρ Τρωικά, I 1, 10, as the only change needed to make the text perfect in sense and connection. This conjecture may be accepted, we think, as almost absolutely sure.

H. Haupt, in a long essay, pp. 139-166, attacks the problem of the authorities followed by Dio Cassius in his history of the second Punic war and of the second and third Macedonian wars. His method of investigation is not very clear, nor are his results stated with much firmness. His classified list of the chief modern works on this subject, from 1835 to 1879, is valuable. He shows first how unfounded and false is the notion that Dion drew by preference rather from Greek than Roman sources. The claims of Silenos, Sosilos and Chaereas to be the sources of Dion are dismissed as unproved and incapable of proof. Polybios, if used by Dion at all, was used not directly but indirectly. It is shown, against the authority of Keller, that the writings of Juba were not known to Dion, but that facts recorded by Juba came to Dion through writers that had followed him. The most valuable part of Haupt's essay is his proof that the question of Dion's authorities is so confused with the general question of Dion's relationship to Arrian, that it awaits its solution from a more careful study than has yet been given to Arrian's text. Until this has been done, the conclusion seems to be that the narrative of Dion is founded, not on any single authority, but on a fusion of several, at least three; and that of these three, the author that Dion followed most closely was Livy.

Unger, in a paper of great length, pp. 48-106, discusses the question of the authorities used by Diodoros in his 11th Book. He starts from the general conclusions reached by Volquardsen; but he follows a new method of investigation, and one of such potency as to modify Volquardsen's results in some points, and to give to them in all points greater scientific precision. The authority followed by Diodoros in each portion of his narrative may be traced and determined by close observation of the year-reckoning that he uses. The Greek historians, in the absence of any universally recognized system of chronology, followed various rules as to the beginning of the year. Some, for example, like Ephoros, followed Spartan usage, as that which had remained unchanged for the longest unbroken period, and began the year with the autumnal equinox, or with the next full moon thereafter. Others, as Timaeos, began the year with the opening of spring. Others again, as the Attic chronographers, began with the summer-solstice. Others, finally, running close on Ephoros' manner, began with the beginning of November. Diodoros now, in combining his various authorities with his own narrative, was so incredibly careless, according to Unger's view, as never to translate their different sys-

tems into any one self-consistent system of his own. Hence the endless confusion and perplexity of Diodoros' narrative in all points of minute chronology. In maintaining this doctrine, Unger refutes the opinion of Droysen and Schmidt that Diodoros follows a uniform system of reckoning by including in his year the last half of one Attic archonship and the first half of the following one. As evidence of Diodoros' carelessness, he points out the existence of *doublers*, when the same event is narrated twice under different years, and the three dates, assigned in three different places to the Sacred War. By following out in detail the variations in the reckoning of time according to the authority followed in each passage, Unger is able to point out the passages that belong to Ephoros, to Timaeos, and to the unknown chronograph respectively. According to his view, Diodoros used Xenophon not at all, Thucydides very seldom, and Ephoros far more than any other authority. But in Sicilian history he followed Timaeos; and in points of literary history he followed an unknown writer, probably Kastor. There is, indeed, an inherent improbability that Diodoros, a man of vigorous common-sense, trained all his life in the accurate details of official work, should have undertaken his gigantic task of history-writing without adopting for his own convenience some uniform system of time-reckoning. But, apart from this improbability, the argument of Unger is clear and convincing.

H. Haupt, in a masterly essay on "Dares, Malalas and Sisypchos," pp. 107-121, deals in a most satisfactory manner with the vexed question as to the origin and propagation of the absurd stories that arose, during Roman and Byzantine times, about the events and the characters of the Trojan war. He aims to fix, in a final and definite manner, the relationship in time and in literary interdependence among the group of writers represented chiefly by Malalas, Isaakos Porphyrogennitos, Manasses and Tzetzes in Greek literature, and by Dares and Dictys in Roman. On this subject, many theories have been formed. According to Dederich, Malalas, Isaakos and Manasses, each independent of the others, all derive from an assumed Greek poet, Dictys, but Dares was independent of Dictys and original. According to Joly, Malalas formed his story by compilation from Dares and a Greek Dictys, and Isaakos formed his from Malalas. According to Dunger and Wagener, Malalas is entirely independent of Dictys. As to any assumed independence of these writers, one from another, Haupt says rightly that it is grossly improbable, nay impossible, that a number of men at different times should have come independently to the fantastic notion of giving elaborate descriptions of the persons, manners and peculiarities of the Homeric heroes. He rejects with merited ridicule Wagener's theory that they happen to agree in these details because they all drew their descriptions from statues of the heroes that were accepted in those times as portraits. The agreement extends to points of character, and even to details of coloring and to eccentricities of manner, such as no statue could have indicated. The substantial agreement in design among all these writers proves derivation of some kind of one from another, and their variations in detail prove only, what can be easily granted, the existence of separate whims and vagaries in each. Between Dares and Malalas, on the one hand, between Dares and Isaakos on the other, the relationship is so close, that they not only describe the same heroes in almost identical order, but they leave the same heroes undescribed.

Between Dares, however, and the Latin Dictys, there is an essential difference : Dictys cleaves close to the outline of the Homeric story, but Dares, dealing with that story as a sensational romance-writer, follows and even outdoes Ptolemaios Chennos in working in absurd variations of his own. It can be proved, however, that Dares did not derive from Malalas, nor Malalas from Dares, but that both used some common source or sources. This common source for both Dares and Malalas was not the fabulous Greek poet Dictys, but some Greek prose-writer upon the Homeric myth. By analysis of Malalas' text, it is found to consist of two kinds of material entirely different and badly fused. One part follows closely the classical story as given in Homer; the other part introduces variations and adulteration of that story. Now, according to Haupt, the former, or Homeric, element in Malalas comes from the Latin Dictys; the latter, or Unhomeric, element comes from the lost work of Sisypchos of Kos, a writer often mentioned by Malalas himself with great reverence. Thus, in the line of descent, Malalas comes from the fusion of the Latin Dictys, with the Greek Sisypchos, and Isaakos, Manasses, Kedrenos and Tzetzes come from Malalas. Dares, on the other hand, draws directly from Sisypchos, but he draws on a plan of his own, with greater independence. Finally, as between the Latin Dictys and the Greek Sisypchos, although the one is undoubtedly the source of the other, we do not know enough to decide which was the inventor, which the plagiarist. The article closes with a temperate defence of Malalas' character against Bentley and Nicolai. Well deserved is the sharp criticism on Bernhardt's estimate of Dares, *Rom. Lit.* p. 770, an estimate more false and misleading than is common even with Bernhardt.

*Greek Antiquities and History.*

The exquisite statue of Hermes with the child Bacchus, found at Olympia on the 8th of May 1877, is discussed by Rumpf, at pp. 197-220, in an essay of much interest and charm of treatment. The essay is illustrated by a rather rough drawing. It is to be regretted that the essay is based, not upon inspection of the statue itself, but upon the cast at Frankfort A.-M. The statue is well described, and the artistic motives acutely analyzed. Rumpf adopts Treu's theory that the missing left hand held the herald's staff; but he rightly rejects the inartistic notion of the thyrsus in the right hand, and he explains the listening pose of the beautiful head by Adler's theory, that with his right hand, to amuse the baby-god, Hermes was sounding the castanets. There was probably a wreath or band of metal around the hair, and the feet, as proved by a fragment more recently discovered, wore sandals without wings. These sandals show traces of bronze color, and the hair and lips show traces of a brownish red. The ascription of this work to Praxiteles, although directly asserted by Pausanias, has been, as is known, disputed and denied by the German archaeologists, Hirschfeld, Treu, Berndorf, etc. They consider it of later date than Praxiteles, and ascribe it either to Lysippus himself or to a pupil of Lysippus, possibly, in order to save Pausanias' credit, to a younger Praxiteles, grandson of the famous sculptor. Against their theories, and in defence of Pausanias' statement, Rumpf makes an argument of great, if not decisive power. He defends the knowledge and the credibility of Pausanias in artistic matters; and then shows in detail how well the style and workmanship of this statue agree with all that we know, either by copies or by mention in literature, of Praxi-

teles' art. Especially, the proportion in length between the head and the figure, 1 to  $7\frac{1}{3}$ , agrees with Praxiteles' earlier time and manner, but is too short for Lysippus' style; and finally the whole figure and the face belong rather to the idealistic manner of Praxiteles than to the growingly realistic portrait-manner of Lysippus. One that has seen even in cast or copy the glorious beauty of the Hermes will feel abiding interest in all that throws light upon its origin; and Rumpf will have the sympathy and good wishes of all in arguing us into the belief that we have in this statue the genuine work of Praxiteles' own hands.

THOS. R. PRICE.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von DR. EUGEN KÖLBING. III Band. Heilbronn, 1880.

I.—Felix Liebrecht. The Folk-Lore Society in London. Liebrecht describes the formation of this society, which counts among its members such distinguished antiquaries as Gladstone, Lubbock, Tylor, and Thoms, and proceeds to review the first volume of the Folk-Lore Record. In so doing he takes occasion to intersperse parallels from the folk-lore of other nations, and thus rescues many superstitions from any suspicion of provincialism by affording evidence of their wide dispersion. A note on Chaucer's Night Spell will attract students who have puzzled over this charm in the Miller's Tale. Perhaps a comparison of the "seynte Petres soster" with the "St. Peter's brother" of the version contained in a foot-note to the passage in Gilman's Chaucer, may throw some light on that particular obscurity. The review ends with some curious excerpts from Blount's Tenures of Land and Customs of Manors.

F. H. Stratmann, in Notes on Old English Grammar, affirms, as against Holtzmann, the existence of A. S. *aw*; points out the baselessness of Koch's assertion that *i* had, in the 14th century, the sound of *ei* (*ai*); derives *orcharð* from a proximate *orccard*, of which the older forms were probably *ortccard*, *ortgeard*; supplies examples of *k* substituted for *ð*, and of nom. and acc. plur. masc. in *e* instead of the regular *s*.

Ed. Tiessen's Contributions to the Determination and Exegesis of the Text of Shakespeare are continued from the second volume (see A. J. P., vol. II p. 112). They touch upon passages in the following plays, viz. Coriolanus, Troilus and Cressida, Tempest, Winter's Tale, Cymbeline, Henry VIII, and Pericles.

Felix Bobertag continues his studies of Pope, in a readable but somewhat too discursive examination of the Essay on Criticism. The nature and extent of Pope's indebtedness to his predecessors in this mode of writing is well illustrated by extensive parallel quotations from the Essay and from Horace, Hieronymus Vida, and Boileau. Passing, however, from external resemblances to the structure of the poem and to its author's conceptions of the poetical art, Bobertag finds, along with unmistakable correspondences between Pope and Boileau, an essential independence on the part of the



former, which becomes still more marked when he is compared with Vida. Horace was his real master, and Pope's style owes much more to Horace than to Boileau. The Essay on Criticism is an exposition of the principle which Pope, and through him the generation of which he was the exponent, professed, namely, that the theory and practice of poetry are absolutely inseparable. Finally, his peculiar use of the word "nature" indicates that he was on the verge of a deeper insight into the essence of poetry, although the actual discovery was reserved for his successors.

E. Kölbing supplies a number of minor contributions to the Exegesis and Textual Criticism of English Poets. The first is on the difficult passage Beowulf v. 168. There are fifteen on obscurities in the Assumpcioun de nostre dame (ed. Lumby), three on Floriz and Blanchefleur, three on Sir Degrevant, one on the Gregorius legend after the Vernon MS. (Herrig's Archiv, 1876), one each on the Political Songs, Maximion, and Spiritual Songs of Bøddeker's Altenglischen Dichtungen, and two on Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, Prologue, vv. 52 and 169. From the note on Prol. 52 we learn that *bord* cannot be the equivalent of the M. H. G. *buhurt*, but must signify *table*, a meaning which is clearly borne out by the passages quoted.

W. Victor has an article on Die wissenschaftliche Grammatik und der englische Unterricht, in which he makes some practical suggestions to teachers of English in Realschulen concerning the utilization of recent researches into English phonology and inflection.

The Book Notices begin with a review of Horstmann's Sammlung altenglischer Legenden (Heilbronn, 1878), by Kölbing, who offers a number of critical emendations and suggestive notes. J. Caro criticises Baumstark's Thomas Morus (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1879). O. S. Seemann, while recognizing what is meritorious and useful in Vincenz Knauer's William Shakespeare, der Philosoph der sittlichen Weltordnung (Innsbruck, 1879), is an unsparing critic of its defective arrangement and immature conclusions. Bobertag's review of Karl Knortz's Longfellow, Literar-historische Studie (Hamburg, 1879), contains an estimate of the poet which most Americans will be slow to accept, inasmuch as it would make his Golden Legend an imitation of Faust, his Building of the Ship an attempt to rival Schiller's Lay of the Bell, and his Masque of Pandora, a fancied improvement on the Legend of Prometheus. Kluge's Beiträge zur Geschichte der germanischen Conjugation (Strassburg, 1879) is fully and approvingly noticed by Hermann Möller. Kölbing, in passing judgment on Konrath's Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik des William von Schorham (Berlin, 1878), recommends to the author the publication of a new edition of Schorham's poems, and ends this department with a notice of Liebrecht's Zur Volkskunde (Heilbronn, 1879).

The volumes criticised under the head of Lehr- und Uebungsbücher für die englische Sprache are of only secondary interest outside of Germany. With this number a Programmschau is begun, the most noteworthy programme being one by Horstmann on a prose version of Barlaam und Josaphat, from MS. Egerton 876, fol. 301.

The Miscellanea contain the Neapolitan Fragment of Sir Isumbras, an apograph by Kölbing; the schedule of Lectures on English Philology at the German universities; a Zeitschriftenschau, which students will find serviceable; together with corrections, a list of books received for review, etc.

II.—A. Rambeau. Chaucer's 'House of Fame' in its relation to Dante's 'Divina Commedia.' This dissertation, which occupies pp. 209–268, is the ablest paper of the number, if not of the volume. The author begins by adverting to the contradictory opinions which have been held regarding Chaucer's acquaintance with the Italian language and literature. Tyrwhitt and Warton agreed in affirming his knowledge of Italian, while Sir Harris Nicolas and Craik were as firmly convinced that he had never read Dante and Petrarch, the latter even going so far as to question whether more than the fame of Italian song had reached his ears. Among the German scholars who have championed the former view are enumerated Fiedler, Pauli, Ebert, Hertzberg, Kissner, and Ten Brink. Following Sandras, in his *Étude sur Chaucer*, and Ten Brink, in his *Studien*, Rambeau undertakes a detailed comparison of the *Divina Commedia* and Chaucer's *House of Fame*, for the purpose of exhibiting the dependence of Chaucer upon Dante, as well in the structure of his poem as in the form of particular passages. It may seem fanciful to extend the analogy to the inscription upon the wall of the temple of Venus, regarded as a parallel to the terrific legend over the gate of hell, or to insist upon the accuracy of both Dante and Chaucer in assigning a date to their respective visions as a substantiation of the author's view; yet it must be remembered that it was only by a multiplication of parallels, individually too weak to bear the burden of proof, yet convincing in their totality, that a demonstration of the proposed thesis could be successfully carried through. Rambeau brings to light a number of verbal correspondences which are, in many instances, too exact and striking to be the work of chance, and supports them by unfolding the more recondite analogies between the two poems in point of machinery, discourses, and pictorial furniture. It is worthy of notice that the essay is preceded by a bibliography of works cited, and that the proofs are clearly conceived and aptly stated, without any darkening of counsel by a superabundance of words.

F. H. Stratmann offers several Emendations of Old English Authors, the works emended being the first series of O. E. Homilies, Layamon, Hali Meidenhad, King Horn (ed. Lumby), and Floriz and Blancheffur. The proposed corrections recommend themselves in almost every case, the author's learning and judgment being equally conspicuous. Stratmann also contributes a few quotations under the heading On the Definite Form of the Adjective in Old English, to prove that the O. E. generally observes the same laws with respect to its use as the Anglo-Saxon, and follows with a note on O. E. *-ere* (*-ære*, *-are*), which, in order to have the question settled, he assumes to have been long in Layamon.

Kölbing continues his Minor Contributions to the Exegesis and Textual Criticisms of English Poets, with a long series of notes on the Middle English Story of Genesis and Exodus. Where he agrees with Wülcker (Alteng-

lisches Lesebuch), Zupitza (Altenglisches Uebungsbuch), and Mätzner (Altenglisches Sprachproben), as against Morris, the editor of the poem, he refrains from all comments upon their views, and observes the same rule with respect to Morris's own corrections in his second edition.

Felix Liebrecht shows, in a short article on English Ballad Poetry, that the Collection of seventy-nine Black-Letter Ballads and Broad-sides, printed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, between the years 1559 and 1597, and re-printed London, 1870, contains two ballads which are translations or adaptations of as many epigrams in the Greek Anthology, the first either by Posidippus or the comic poet Plato, and the second by Metrodorus. A "Song of an English Merchant, borne at Chichester," one of the Roxburghe Ballads, is discovered to rest upon the ancient custom of absolving a criminal from the death penalty on condition that a maiden should resolve to take him in marriage. Still another song of the same collection is compared with the "Zigeunerin," No. 368 of Simrock's Volkslieder, and a ballad, entitled "The Little Barly-Corne," with a German Volksbuch of the 17th century, bearing the partial title, "Martyrologia Hordei, wie das edle Gersten-Korn so viel Marter ausstehen muss."

H. Ottmann treats of the choice of English reading matter in the German realschule of the first order. Presupposing an elementary knowledge of grammar, to be acquired in *tertia*, he would begin in lower *secunda* with Robinson Crusoe, and follow with extracts from the English historians in upper *secunda*. In *prima* the scholar will then study the first two chapters of Macaulay's History of England, Milton's Paradise Lost, and devote two winter semesters to Shakespeare. Private reading of easier pieces will give him fluency, and strengthen his confidence in his own independent ability.

In the Book Notices, Stratmann commends Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English Language (Oxford, 1879), though he is able to catalogue a tolerably large number of errors. D. Asher passes a favorable judgment upon Karl Warncke's essay On the Formation of English Words by Means of Ablaut. C. Blasius reviews Snider's System of Shakespeare's Dramas, and pronounces the ideas to be new and important, and the style lucid, straightforward and dignified. Besides, there are reviews by Seemann of the Works of William Shakespeare, Part I, edited by W. Wagner; of Karl Elze's Eine Aufführung im Globus-Theater; and of two works by E. Hermann, Die Bedeutung des Sommernachtstraums für die Shakespeare-biographie und die Geschichte des englischen Dramas, and Shakespeare der Kämpfer; by Körner of O. Brenner's Angelsächsische Sprachproben mit Glossar, and Botkine's La chanson des runes, texte, traduction et notes; and by W. Victor of A. M. de Sainte Claire's Dictionary of English, French and German idioms, figurative expressions and proverbial sayings.

Of Lehr- und Uebungsbücher für die englische Sprache there seems to be no lack, since seven are criticised at length in this number. The reports upon the publications of English Societies contain a description by O. S. Seemann of the recent issues by the new Shakspeare Society, and the

Miscellanea an obituary notice of Hertzberg, the German translator of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.

III.—C. Horstmann prints, with a short introduction, the epic legend of Thomas Beket, contained in the unique MS. Corp. Chr. Coll. Camb. 298. The author was Laurentius Wade, a Canterbury monk of the fifteenth century, who composed, from materials furnished by Herbert Bosham and Bishop John of Exeter, and in direct imitation of Lydgate's legends, this rhymed biography of more than 2300 lines. The diction is not only prosaic, but still further marred by the introduction of the most alien and least manageable Latin idioms.

Kölbing, under the heading 'Zur altenglischen Glossen-Literatur, takes occasion to correct, from a fresh collation of the MSS in the British Museum, a number of errors in Wülcker's contributions to Anglia II pp. 354-374.

F. H. Stratmann, in a page of Notes on Anglo-Saxon Grammar, explains *funde* and *wurde*, when used as preterite indicatives of the first and third persons, as analogical formations on the model of the second person, and contends that the radical *o* of *dohtor* should not be written long, as is done by Grein, Kluge and others, since *Orm* doubles the following *h*, and the umlaut of short *o* in Anglo-Saxon is proved by the Rushworth and Lindisfarne Gospels.

The last paper is a Report of the Tests Committee of the St. Petersburg Shakspeare Circle. The authors, J. Harrison, J. Goodlet, and R. Boyle, undertake to lay down definite criteria by which to discriminate run-on lines and light or weak endings from their opposites. In so doing they consider themselves obliged to take issue with Mr. Furnivall and Mr. Ingram, both of whom, they complain, attempt to set up a euphonical instead of a grammatical standard, thus introducing a subjective element into their determinations which leads to frequent self-contradictions, and vitiates the results for scientific purposes. In conclusion, they define their position with regard to the province of metrical tests in terms which will bear quotation: "The Committee consider that metrical tests alone cannot be held to settle a question of authorship or chronology, when unsupported by other proofs. They can never be relied upon against external evidence, nor, with certain restrictions, against clear allusions in the text. They become doubtful whenever there is a general aesthetic argument, such as the development of character, against them. If they are found to agree with ascertained external evidence in certain cases, they become, in the absence of that in other cases, of great importance, and the aesthetic argument must be very strong which upsets them."

It remains to be said that the punctuation of this article is often so bad as to destroy the sense, and that Prof. Hertzberg's name is spelled "Hertzberg." It might also be suggested that such a sentence as the following hardly carries its meaning on its face: "The general characteristic (*i. e.* of light and weak endings) is that of monosyllabic grammatical forms, separated, at the end of a line, from the words with which they are connected."

In the Book Notices, Stratmann points out a number of errors in Prof. Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, Part II, and Elze's *Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists*. (Halle, 1880) is favorably noticed by O. S. Seemann. The criticisms of *Lehr- und Übungsbücher für die englische Sprache* occupy some twenty pages.

The Miscellanea include Notes on the Dublin MS. of the Alliterative Romance of Alexander, by J. H. Hessels; on Havelok the Dane and the Norse King Olaf Kuaran, by Prof. Storm; and on An Unknown MS. of the Ancrén Riwlé, by Kölbing, besides the usual schedule of Lectures on English Philology and the *Zeitschriftenschau*.

ALBERT S. COOK.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

A recent visit to the Scriptorium at Mill Hill, where the Philological Society's English Dictionary is gradually assuming form and consistency under the hands of its indefatigable editor, Dr. J. A. H. Murray, enables me to lay before the readers of the JOURNAL a few facts regarding its recent progress, by way of supplement to the information which, through various channels, has already found its way to the American public.

The Scriptorium itself is a modest building enough, consisting of a single long, low room adjoining the editor's residence; but the walls of this room are literally lined with the bundles of written slips already sent in by readers; these are arranged in alphabetical order by trained helpers, as soon as practicable after their reception, and are then consigned to the pigeon-holes, which cover the whole available wall-space from the floor as high as the hand can reach. The number of quotations already returned is, according to the report of Dr. Murray before the Philological Society, not far from 657,000, while blank slips have been issued to the number of 817,625. These slips, if laid end to end, would, it is calculated, extend over a distance of 87 miles, and, allowing only half a minute of the editor's time to each one, the preliminary inspection and disposition of them would require nearly three working years.

The authors represented in the Reference Index already number 2700, and the titles of separate works amount, in the aggregate, to 4500.

The number of readers at present enrolled is over 800, of whom 510 are still engaged in their work, while the remainder have either finished the books they accepted or have temporarily ceased to read.

It is gratifying to learn that America has responded with marked promptitude and enthusiasm to the appeals which have been circulated by the Society throughout the English-speaking world, and that the coöperation of American readers has been of essential service in carrying the work thus far